

**REMARKS**

**Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)**

It is hereby requested that the term to respond to the Examiner's Action of December 7, 2007 be extended three months, from March 7, 2008 to June 9, 2008 (June 7 being a Saturday and June 8 being a Sunday).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee and any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 1-9 and 12-26 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

**Specification Objections**

Applicant has at least twice addressed the issue of the use of trademarks in the application. Applicant has pointed the Examiner to the language of M.P.E.P 608.01(v), and the Examiner has acknowledged that this section pertains to the proper use of trademarks in the patent specification (see page 19 of Office Action dated May 7, 2007, last two lines of page 19). As best as can be determined, the remaining objection to the use of trademarks is, indeed, related to their use in the patent specification, and thus, the cited section of the M.P.E.P. applies. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification, to the extent such an objection is still in the Office Action.

**Claim Objections**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 1, 12 and 17-19 for various informalities. These claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

**The §112 Rejections**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 12-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The present specification clearly articulates its application to grid computing. It is well known that grid computing involves the interconnection and interaction of multiple computers, often referred to as "nodes", to share the computing tasks that are required. The computers that make up the nodes ARE computational resources, and this is so well known that further description thereof is unnecessary. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-9 and 12-26 for failing to comply with the written description requirement

**Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §103**

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 and 12-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0088688 to Hejlsberg et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,185,046 to Ferstl.

**The Present Invention**

The present invention teaches automatically developing objects using a plurality of context derived models residing within a computational grid. An object meta language (OML) is used to allow a programmer to define an application. Using OML, the programmer creates a document describing the required object. Specifically, claim 1 recites “generating a description of an application; providing said description to a web service; parsing said description by said web service” (lines 3-5). In these limitations, the OML document is submitted to a group of context derived models residing at various computational nodes on the grid. Then, a web service is used to parse the OML document and select the appropriate node. Specifically, Claim 1 further recites “locating a suitable coding module via a node contained within a computation grid wherein said computation grid includes a plurality of computers sharing computational resources; supplying said description to said node” (lines 6-7). Next, the OML document is provided to the selected node, which applies object description variables using a transform language to produce a defined output object. The defined output object is then returned to the programmer. Specifically, claim 1 finally recites “applying said description to said coding module to generate an output object; and returning said output object” (lines 8-9). By utilizing a computational grid, additional computing power from otherwise idle nodes is used, thereby improving the overall performance of the system.

**The Examiner Has Not Established a *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness**

The Examiner relies upon U.S. Patent No. 7,185,046 to Ferstl as allegedly teaching the locating of a suitable coding module on a computational grid, wherein said computational grid

includes a plurality of computers sharing computational resources. Essentially, the Examiner is relying on Ferstl as teaching grid computing.

The present invention requires the identifying of modules to be combined from the description encapsulated within the OML. Without the unique identification of data requirements from the OML descriptive sources, the computing grid would not be able to find the desired resources. Claim 1 expressly claims locating a suitable coding module via a node contained within a computational grid. In other words grid technology is used to find the coding module as well as obtain it. The module may or may not reside on the computational grid. This is neither taught nor suggested by Fertl (nor Hejlsberg).

Claim 1 also expressly claims applying said description to said suitable coding module to generate an output object. A process on a node within the grid knows through known grid processing about all other grid processes, as shown in Ferstl. However, the claimed invention then uses OML processing - this step does not have to be completed from an XSL transform - to assemble the combined results of the grids work. In other words, the result is a combination of many results from the grid and assembled according to the specifications within the OML by the grid. This assembly process is neither taught nor suggested in either Fertl or Hejlsberg.

The independent claim expressly recites these elements neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-9 and 12-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**Conclusion**

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee to Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

Respectfully submitted,

June 9, 2008  
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/  
Mark D. Simpson  
Registration No. 32,942

SAUL EWING LLP  
Centre Square West  
1500 Market Street, 38<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2189  
Telephone: 215 972 7880  
Facsimile: 215 972 4169  
Email: MSimpson@saul.com